

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                 | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/617,361                                      | 07/17/2000      | David N. Harris      | 0013-011                | 8110             |
| 40972   | 7590 07/29/2004 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| HENNEMAN & SAUNDERS<br>714 WEST MICHIGAN AVENUE |                 |                      | ALVAREZ, RAQUEL         |                  |
| THREE RIVERS, MI 49093                          |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                 |                      | 3622                    |                  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004 | 4                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No. Applicant(s) 09/617.361 HARRIS, DAVID N. **Advisory Action** Examiner **Art Unit** Raquel Alvarez 3622 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 6/25/2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: . Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_. Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: .

Raquel Alvarez Examine

Art Unit: 3622

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the 112, 1st paragraph rejection, the cited pages specified by the Applicant discloses the card holder initiating verification of an account but doesn't disclose the system notifying the card holder that his or her account have been disabled.

With respect to the 112, 2nd rejection, the rejection has nothing to do with lack of antecedent basis. Instead, the rejection was confusing in nature because the claim recite an account-holder initiating a connection with himself and therefore correction is required.

Applicant argues that Blonder doesn't teach instructions from the account-holder to automatically verify subsequent transactions approval requests. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because the alert and approval fields selected by the card owner of Blonder can be accessed at anytime, at the present transaction and/or at any subsequent transactions thereafter and therefore it meets the claim limitations.

Applicant agrees that Jao teaches "storing specific limitations and/or restrictions that are placed on a particular account by a cardholder" but argues that Jao doesn't teach receiving instructions from an account-holder. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because if the restrictions are placed by the account holder as admitted by Applicant then the instructions as to how to handle the account must be received by the account holder.